



SARAH M. MATZ  
PARTNER  
SARAH@ADELMANMATZ.COM  
DIR: (646) 650-2213

May 21, 2021

**VIA ECF**

**MEMO ENDORSED**

Hon. Laura Taylor Swain  
Daniel Patrick Moynihan  
United States Courthouse  
500 Pearl St.  
Courtroom 17C  
New York, NY 10007-1312

Re: *JLM Couture, Inc. v. Hayley Paige Gutman* (1:20-cv-10575-LTS)

Hon. Judge Swain:

We represent Plaintiff JLM Couture, Inc. (“JLM”) in the above-referenced action. Pursuant to Rule A.1.a.i of Your Honor’s Individual Practices, JLM files this letter to request that the Court memo endorse this letter to direct the clerk in the ECF Development and Support Unit to associate JLM’s opposition papers to Defendant Hayley Paige Gutman’s (“Gutman”) motion to dissolve, which were filed on May 19, 2021 (Dkt Nos. 156-160) as an opposition to Gutman’s motion to dissolve (Dkt No. 141).

When we were filing on ECF as an opposition to a motion, the ECF system requires you to link the opposition papers to the original motion event. However, ECF was not showing a motion or order to show cause event for Gutman’s motion to dissolve (Dkt No. 141), to associate the opposition papers with.<sup>1</sup> In order to ensure that the papers were timely filed, we filed JLM’s opposition in association with Dct No. 109, which was Gutman’s motion for reconsideration. We noted this to Your Honor and opposing counsel in our email transmission of courtesy copies and indicated that we would be speaking with the Clerk’s office to correct that issue.

A clerk in the ECF Development and Support Unit has advised that he or another clerk can associate JLM’s opposition to Gutman’s motion to dissolve (Dkt Nos. 156-160) with the correct motion event i.e., Gutman’s motion to dissolve (Dkt No. 141) if directed to do so by the Court.

JLM respectfully requests that the Court direct the ECF Development and Support Unit, or any Clerk with such authorization, to associate Dkt Nos. 156-160 as an opposition to Gutman’s

---

<sup>1</sup> We believe this issue occurred because the application was originally filed as an order to show cause, but no order to show cause was ever issued. The Court’s May 5, 2021 Order “decline[d] to issue an order to show cause but treat[ed] Defendant’s application as a motion to dissolve . . .”. As there was neither an order to show cause issued or a notice of motion filed, we believe the event was not showing up in ECF as an event that opposition papers could be filed in response to.

motion to dissolve Dkt No. 141, instead of Dkt No. 109. This will avoid confusion in the Court's docket entries.

We have conferred with Gutman's counsel who has consented to this request.

We appreciate the Court's time and consideration, and should Your Honor need any further information, we are available at the Court's convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

ADELMAN MATZ P.C.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'SM' with a colon, representing Sarah M. Matz.

Sarah M. Matz, Esq.

Cc. Attorneys of Record (via ECF)

The request is granted and the Clerk's Office is directed as set forth above. DE# 161 resolved.  
SO ORDERED.

5/24/2021

/s/ Laura Taylor Swain, Chief USDJ